DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 755 JC 000 696

TITLE	Faculty Development: A Senate Issue.
INSTITUTION	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	29p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Governing Councils; *Community Colleges; *Educational Practices; *Faculty Development; Teacher Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes existing practices as reported by the faculty development survey respondents, outlines steps and offers recommendations that local senates can take to increase faculty involvement in faculty development programs, and provides information on possible untapped professional development funding sources. It includes the following sections: (1) an historical perspective; (2) a look at the problems today, which are primarily related to funding, policy, and accountability; (3) survey results, which reveal that: committee structures vary, funding allocations are uncertain and inadequate, faculty involvement is a problem, reassigned time is inadequate, and allocation tracking is mysterious; and (4) strengthening faculty development programs, which examines policies, allocation approaches, a strong faculty voice, appointment of faculty members to staff development committees, the role of the local senate, the staff development coordinator, resources and reassigned time, and reports. Concludes that local academic senates need to regain a central role in faculty development to assure that faculty are able to have the vibrant and rich intellectual life that Assembly Bill 1725 envisioned and that their primary commitment to teaching makes imperative. Appendices include: Education Code Article 5 Community College Faculty and Staff Development Fund 87150, Title 5 Regulations 53200, Statewide Academic Senate Faculty Development Committee Field Survey for Position Paper instrument, and an example of a staff development policy. (VWC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 755

Faculty Development: A Senate Issue

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Adopted April 2000

R.M. Silverman

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC000696

Faculty Development Committee
Barbara Sawyer, Diablo Valley College, Chair
Lina Chen, Los Angeles Trade Technical College
Loretta Hernandez, Laney College
Laurie Lema, Diablo Valley College
Nancy Silva, American River College
Jeannine Stein, Los Medanos College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT 1

BACKGROUND: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE 2

THE PROBLEMS TODAY 4

SURVEY RESULTS 6

Committee Structures Vary 6

Funding Allocations Uncertain and Inadequate 6

Faculty Involvement a Problem 7

Reassigned Time Inadequate 7

Allocation Tracking Mysterious 8

STRENGTHENING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS 8

Policies 8

Allocation Approaches 9

A Strong Faculty Voice 9

Appointment of Faculty Members to Staff Development Committees 10

The Role of the Local Senate 10

The Staff Development Coordinator 11

Resources and Reassigned Time 11

Reports 12

RECOMMENDATIONS 12

CONCLUSION 14

APPENDIX 15

ABSTRACT

Faculty development programs are crucial to the continuing expertise and professional advancement of faculty members. AB 1725 recognized this truism when it was noted that although community colleges faced the barrier of fewer resources for faculty development than other higher education segments, community college faculty should be no less intellectually engaged than their colleagues in other segments.

When the Board of Governors was required by AB 1725 to Astrengthen local academic senates,@ it added to Title 5 eleven items of academic and professional matters, including A8) policies for faculty professional development activities,@ upon which academic senates were guaranteed the right to collegial consultation. Nevertheless, over the years *faculty development* and *staff development* have been somewhat collapsed into one category. Local senates have been less involved in the programs than might be hoped, according to a November 1999 faculty development survey by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Survey respondents indicated concerns around staff development committee structures, allocation processes, lack of faculty involvement in faculty development discussions, and tracking of allocations.

This paper will summarize existing practices as reported by the faculty development survey respondents, outline steps and offer recommendations that local senates can take to increase faculty involvement in faculty development programs, and provide information on possible untapped professional development funding sources.

It is the conclusion of the authors that local academic senates need to regain a central role in faculty development to assure that faculty are able to have the Avibrant and rich intellectual life@ that
AB 1725 envisioned and that their primary commitment to teaching makes imperative.

BACKGROUND: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

With the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 1725 in 1989, California community college faculty were charged with broad responsibilities. It was the intent of the Legislature to improve academic quality and in doing so the Legislature saw fit Ato authorize more responsibility for faculty members in duties that are incidental to their primary professional duties.@ (AB 1725 '4(n))

The Legislature indicated that:

> AThe recruitment of faculty into the community colleges, and the maintaining of morale and enthusiasm among the faculty depends upon the intellectual and personal environment within which faculty work. Much of that environment is created by their own authority over the substantive direction of the programs and courses in which they work, through the quality of their relationship with the college administration, and in the quality of their interactions with the communities of students they teach. At the same time, it is apparent that faculty morale comes from their engagement in the development of new and innovative programs, from their engagement in professional and discipline-based associations, and from an active, intellectual life as scholars and teachers.@ (AB 1725, '4(i))
>
> ACommunity colleges have less resources available for faculty professional and intellectual development than do other segments of the system of higher education, and this disparity may become a substantial barrier to the future recruitment of quality faculty. Yet, faculty in the community colleges should be no less intellectually engaged than their colleagues in the other segments. Their primary commitment to teaching makes it imperative that they have a vibrant and rich intellectual life.@ (AB 1725 '4 (j))
>
> AThe success of the assessment, counseling, and placement system in the California community colleges will depend upon the commitment and dedication of trained student services staff. Y It is essential that the college have adequate service staff and that they be superbly trained, especially in view of the current diversity of student educational needs in the community colleges.@ (AB 1725 '4 (k))

To that effect the legislation affirmed that Aprofessional development for faculty, support staff, student services staff, and administrators is vital.@ (AB1725 '4 (h)) AB 1725 not only charged faculty with greater responsibilities and control over their professional activities in California community colleges but also promised the provision of state Ageneral funds Y for supporting locally developed and implemented faculty and staff development programs.@ Incumbent on the receipt of these funds is an affidavit from each chief executive officer to the System Chancellor that the staff development funds have been allocated with the assistance of a Staff Development Advisory Committee composed of faculty and staff (Education Code '87151a). In addition, Article 5, '87150 of the Education Code (Attachment A) specifies that the funds are also

conditional on the annual establishment of a human resources plan developed pursuant to a needs assessment in collaboration with faculty and staff.

The authorized uses of funds allocated under this article shall include all of the following:

(a) Improvement of teaching.
(b) Maintenance of current academic and technical knowledge and skills.
(c) In-service training for vocational education and employment preparation programs.
(d) Retraining to meet changing institutional needs.
(e) Intersegmental exchange programs.
(f) Development of innovations in instructional and administrative techniques and program effectiveness.
(g) Computer and technological proficiency programs.
(h) Courses and training implementing affirmative action and upward mobility programs.
(i) Other activities determined to be related to educational and professional development (AB 1725 Article 5).

The Legislature specifically aimed to strengthen academic senates as the prime vehicle for faculty governance to carry out these expanded responsibilities. When the Board of Governors encoded the AB 1725 legislative mandates into regulation, included was the mandate Ato strengthen local senates.@ APolicies for faculty professional development activities@ was listed among the academic and professional matters about which local academic senates and boards of trustees are required to engage in collegial consultation (Title 5, ' 53200, (Attachment B)). Collegial consultation, as defined in Title 5 Regulations, requires that faculty and boards of trustees Acome to mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation or policy@ or that Athe board relies primarily on the recommendations of the academic senate on academic and professional matters.@ Establishing policies Afor the appropriate delegation of authority and responsibility to the academic senate@ is a minimum condition for the receipt of state apportionment (Education Code ' 70901, Title 5, ' 53203).

Regardless of the source of funds or reporting requirements, policies related to faculty professional development require collegial consultation. AProcesses for institutional planning and budget development@ are also included among the eleven academic and professional matters; these often are inextricably tied to staff development initiatives. It is apparent that in addition to
AB 1725 allocations, other professional development policies and resources designed to enhance faculty development should be matters for consultation between faculty and local boards (or their designees). These would include training and development funds provided under such state-funded programs as the AB 1725 specified Staff Development Funds, the Chancellor=s Office Staff Diversity Funds and the Telecommunication and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP).

THE PROBLEMS TODAY

Lack of funding has constantly plagued professional development programs. Since the early 1990s, there has been no increase in AB 1725 professional development funding in spite of growth in faculty. This AB 1725 funding has remained constant at approximately $5 million, stalling much needed reform. The low level of available funding has exacerbated concern over how that money is spent. Given the importance of professional development in maintaining faculty currency and teaching effectiveness, the investments made with the relatively small amounts available take on great significance at the college level.

In addition to lack of funding, there is concern about the policies by which staff development dollars are allocated. Although the Education Code and Title 5 Regulations related to professional development continue in effect, compliance seems to have fallen by the way in a number of districts. Recent resolutions passed by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges indicate a need on many campuses for more faculty involvement in designing faculty development programs and in consulting on policies for allocating faculty development funds.

S96 12.4 Staff Diversity Funds

Whereas the California Legislature appropriates, based on AB 1725, and the Chancellor=s Office distributes, funds to each district as staff diversity funds, and

Whereas an informal poll of the Senate faculty development committee has shown that these funds are variously distributed at colleges/districts, sometimes with little or no faculty input, and

Whereas the informal poll has also indicated that there is often no local publicity regarding how different constituents at a campus/district may use these funds, and

Whereas local and district academic senates should, according to shared governance, be involved in the local/district allocation of staff diversity funds,

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recommends to local senates that:

A. *They be informed how staff diversity funds are being spent on their campus.*
B. *The local senate president sign off on reports to the Chancellor=s office on the local use of staff diversity money.*
C. *Local senates in the spirit of shared governance, have a liaison to whatever campus district committees make decisions regarding staff diversity funds.*
D. *Local senates be informed of what staff diversity money is not spent locally and what funds may roll over to the following year.*

S96 12.5 Faculty and Staff Development, Staff Diversity Funds

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges request that the Board of Governors include in Title 5 the proviso that the annual accountability reports to the Chancellor=s Office on the use of staff development and staff diversity funds include a sign off by the college=s academic senate president, and

Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to investigate ways to improve the staff diversity funds in order to comply with the legislative intent in AB1725 creating these funds.

S98 12.01 Accountability Reports

Whereas local academic senates have the responsibility for local faculty development activities and district wide faculty development activities in accordance with AB 1725, and

Whereas local and district academic senates continue to have difficulty with the accountability of the use of staff development and staff diversity funds as these funds are used for faculty development activities in many staff development programs, and

Whereas there are no recommended formal ratios for the equitable distribution of funds among faculty, classified and administrative staff, and

Whereas Resolution 12.5 S96 requested that Athe Board of Governors include in Title 5 Regulations the provision that the annual accountability reports to the Chancellor=s Office on the use of staff development and staff diversity funds include a sign off by the college=s academic senate president,@

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to pursue vigorously, in the current revision process of the Education Code being conducted by the Chancellor=s Office, the local academic senate president=s sign off on annual accountability reports of staff development and staff diversity funds.

Specifically, the resolutions call for more information, more faculty involvement, and greater accountability. The resolutions maintain that faculty must have the appropriate voice in determining policies related to faculty development. They also urge that faculty be involved in the accountability reporting of staff development and staff diversity funds. They call for an academic senate sign off on required state documents including the Staff Development Human Resources Development Plan and related budget reports to ensure that policies and programs adhere to the minimum conditions. The Chancellor=s Office should refuse to accept reports and plans that do not conform to expected minimum conditions in this area. As the resolutions indicate, to fulfill their responsibility in this area, local academic senates must receive the appropriate information.

SURVEY RESULTS

In November 1999, the Faculty Development Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges surveyed local academic senate presidents (Attachment C) to gather information regarding the current practices of faculty development programs and their funding mechanisms. Since Apolicies and procedures regarding faculty development@ are one of the eleven academic and professional matters upon which collegial consultation is required, the survey was developed to focus on the link between academic senates and their colleges= staff development programs. Twenty percent of the surveys were returned, and, in general, results indicated that senates were not as involved in collegial consultation over faculty development as they might be and that academic senate presidents were unclear on the role that senates should be taking in faculty development areas. At least two Senate presidents reported that they were unfamiliar with faculty development practices and therefore unable to complete the survey. Those responding reported major concerns with staff development committee structures, policies regarding funding allocations, lack of faculty involvement in designing faculty development programs, inadequate reassigned time, and the lack of information about and the inability to track funding sources.

Committees Structures Vary

Most campuses reported the existence of a cross constituency staff development committee. About half indicated that the committee included a majority of faculty in its membership. In many cases, however, the faculty members were not appointed by the academic senate, which is a violation of the academic senate=s right to appointment (Title 5, ' 53203(f)). Rather it was reported that faculty were chosen by administrative appointment or by election from divisions and department or they simply volunteered, thereby diminishing direct academic senate involvement. Few colleges reported the existence of a senate faculty development committee concerned exclusively with faculty development programs.

Funding Allocations Uncertain and Inadequate

In determining the allocation of AB 1725 funds, the majority of respondents indicated that the cross constituency committee, that may not contain a majority of faculty or whose members may not have been appointed by the senate, had the primary responsibility for dividing the dollars among classified staff, administrators, and faculty.

Nearly universally the largest unmet need for faculty development was identified as the need for more funding: more money for technology training, money to encourage the development of innovative projects, more money for conferences and travel related to conferences, and money to buy reassigned time for faculty to pursue innovative projects. One respondent reported Aa long standing disparity@ in funding conference attendance for administrators out of proportion to

conference attendance for faculty. A(We need) more significant input in the (process for determining the) allocation of funds for Y conferences,@ concluded another. Indeed, as noted above in spite of increases in full- and part-time faculty numbers, the AB1725 staff development allocation has not increased substantially in eleven years.

Faculty Involvement a Problem

If the local academic senate is to ensure that the faculty voice is properly weighted in the determination of faculty development priorities and funding priorities, the formation of a strong tie between the staff development coordinator and/or committee chair and the academic senate is essential. At one college the staff development coordinator sits as a member of the academic senate and is given the opportunity to report at every senate meeting. In that instance of frequent give and take, the coordinator is able to engender ongoing support and enthusiasm and to design a cohesive program geared to the needs of the faculty as they are communicated to her. She is able to handle small concerns before they become big problems. In most colleges, however, the coordinator reports to the academic senate on a Aregular@ basis or when requested. In one college that Aregular@ basis is once a year. In several colleges, it appears that the coordinator attends academic senate meetings only Awhen problems occur or when the coordinator needs help in a project that administration is not supporting.@ In other colleges, there is almost no contact between the staff development coordinators and the academic senate, which was noted Aas somewhat of a problem.@ Another practice involves the academic senate president sitting as a member of the staff development committee. In some cases the staff development coordinator and/or committee chair is chosen by the academic senate or in consultation with the senate which helps to forge the link between faculty development and the academic senate.

Reassigned Time Inadequate

A chronic problem reported on the surveys was the small amount of reassigned time awarded to staff development leaders to accomplish their considerable duties. As one respondent noted, the Areassigned time was underfunded by historical precedent.@ Indeed, this precedent was prevalent throughout the responding colleges. Reassigned time, often divided among two or more staff development leaders, ranged from zero to 120 percent of a full-time load, with the average being 40 percent. In one case the staff development committee co-chairs, who were doing the work of a coordinator, received a one-thousand dollar stipend each per semester, which was reported as an inadequate sum for the work that the co-coordinators were expected to perform. In all but two colleges, there was no apparent policy in place for the awarding of reassigned time. One respondent reported Ait is always a fight,@ a sentiment echoed by other college respondents who reported that reassigned time had to be negotiated by the academic senates. In fact, in several colleges, it was noted that the staff development reassigned time was part of the senate=s usually already meager overall allotment.

Allocation Tracking Mysterious and Inadequate

Another troubling area for academic senate presidents was the inability to track staff development dollars. Funding sources seemed a mystery to most. Even the amount and use of AB 1725 funds that have traditionally comprised the majority of staff development funds were not well understood. One academic senate president reported that some dollars go to the faculty, some to classified, and some to travel and conference. Several reports indicated unwillingness on the part of administrators to share budget information. One senate president stated that Abudget categories are rarely, if ever shared by the dean.@ Another noted the need to understand professional development and diversity training budgets, information which the respondent said was not shared by the dean who serves as the staff development officer. These comments sum up the problems many academic senates face as they try to find scarce staff development dollars.

STRENGTHENING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Survey respondents indicated a clear need for more information on the legislative intent and mandates regarding staff development programs and for a sharper understanding of funding resources and allocation policies. They sought a stronger faculty voice in their own professional development. Respondents sought information on faculty development policies, committee structures, allocation processes, the role of the staff development coordinator, the selection of the staff development coordinator, and the role of local senates in faculty development.

Policies

A strong faculty development program starts with a clearly understood and agreed-upon policy with the board of trustees. Local boards are required to adopt policies to ensure that they consult collegially with academic senates on academic and professional matters. For each of the eleven academic and professional items outlined in Title 5, ' 53200 (c), the board should have delineated whether it will rely primarily on the recommendations of the academic senate or reach mutual agreement with the senate. A written faculty development policy that requires primary reliance or mutual agreement, depending upon the local agreement between the board and the academic senate, will specify the role of the academic senate in faculty development issues. It will specify how the staff development coordinator will be selected, and it will detail how reassigned time is to be allocated to staff development positions. (See the Academic Senate and Community College League of California (CCLC) paper *Participating Effectively in District and College Governance*, Questions 16 and 17, and Scenarios numbers 2 and 14 for discussion of relevant good practices).

Clearly, the academic senate is responsible for recommendations on policies related to *faculty* development according to Title 5, ' 53200. Given that *staff* development policies have significant impact on staff members (including administrative staff members), staff should be

afforded opportunities for effective participation in the development of policies related to their staff development. Therefore, in districts where it seems appropriate to develop an overall staff development policy, (see Attachment D for a college faculty development policy developed along these lines) those policies would be developed in consultation with all constituency groups. Nevertheless, the faculty development component of the policy is a matter for collegial consultation between the academic senate and the board of trustees. The tendency to collapse faculty and staff development policies into one policy can lead to confusion over the appropriate role of the academic senate in faculty professional development. It is the senate=s responsibility to ensure that collegial consultation takes place as specified in the agreed-upon faculty development policy and to request consultation immediately if the policy is not being followed or if no policy has been adopted.

Allocation Approaches

AB1725 funds accrue to each district based on an FTE formula. Some districts have found it expedient and fair to extend that formula to local college allocations by distributing the money according to the percentages of faculty, classified staff, and administrators. An advantage of the formula method is that it provides stability in funding and enables all constituencies to engage in both short- and long-term planning. Since the AB 1725 allocations remain reasonably stable from year to year, operating according to a formula allows all groups to budget for projects that might carry over from year to year.

A disadvantage to a formula approach developed on employee numbers is that it may not direct sufficient dollars to faculty development needs that were seen as priorities in AB 1725. AB 1725 was intended primarily Ato improve academic quality@ (AB 1725 '4 (n)). Therefore, a funding policy based on a formula that gives primary consideration to faculty development might be closer to the intent of the legislation.

A Strong Faculty Voice

Norton Grubb and Associates in their 1999 book on community college teaching, *Honored But Invisible,* in at least six different references point out deficiencies in staff development programs and the effect those deficiencies have on teaching expertise. They imply that staff development programs in community colleges are not being appropriately designed to improve teaching. In interviews with community college instructors nationwide, Grubb and Associates were told of the lack of staff development: Astaff development is random and unfocused,@ (p. 75) Ain-service training and staff development is diffuse and unhelpful,@ (p. 229) Ait is almost impossible (to develop (academic) standards) when there are no public forums to discuss these issues, when instructors have to work them out on their own@ (p. 240). Grubb stated, Awe saw few workshops devoted to the art of question and answer (pedagogy) included in staff development

activities.@ (p. 247) He maintains faculty development programs ought to forego Aone-shot affairs Y >fancy educators coming and talking to us about things= to more sustained and collective efforts.@ (p. 363)

It would follow that faculty development activities should be designed by faculty who know their needs, who can develop forums geared toward teaching excellence, and who can design sustained and collective efforts such as Instructional Skills Workshops or Classroom Research Projects that continue over a period of time; the in-service model of faculty development that depends on a one-shot Afancy speaker@ from outside the college community, selected perhaps by an administrator, is to be discouraged.

Regardless of the method of obtaining it, a strong faculty voice is essential in identifying faculty development needs and implementing programs to address those needs. One option for assuring a faculty voice, particularly when there has been a disconnect between the local academic senate and the administration, is to create a separate senate faculty development committee, in addition to any cross constituency staff development committee. This committee would be charged with identifying, planning, and funding activities that will best serve faculty. The chair of the faculty development committee will be appointed by the academic senate and report to the senate on a regular basis, so that the senate can influence the professional growth and training activities that are being planned for its members. The appointment of faculty members to committees of the academic senate is a function of the senate and requires no consultation with administration.

Appointment of Faculty Members to Staff Development Committees

Faculty members who are appointed to cross constituency staff development committees by administrators or who volunteer may not view themselves as representatives of the local academic senate and may not feel the responsibility to report to the senate. Title 5, ' 53202 (f) affirms the right of academic senates to make appointments of faculty members to all college and district committees, after Aconsultation@ with the chief executive officer or his or her designee. Whereas Acollegial consultation@ requires agreement between the senates and the board, Aconsultation@ implies good-faith discussions, but not necessarily agreement. Therefore, senates may make their own appointments after consultation even if agreement with the administration is not reached.

The Role of the Senate

Once established, staff development committees operate to implement the policies agreed upon between the academic senate and the board. Should proposals for policy changes or new priorities arise in the committee, these should generally be referred to the academic senate for deliberation and recommendation. Remember that collegial consultation occurs with the academic senate, not with committees (See the Academic Senate and CCLC paper *Participating*

Effectively in District and College Governance, p. 7-8, and see also Scenarios, p. 13 - 15).

Staff Development Coordinator

The staff development coordinator by necessity will have many interactions with the faculty and the faculty development committee. As a coordinator should be expected to work closely with the academic senate in determining policy directions and priorities for faculty professional development, it is important that the coordinator understand his or her role and respect the responsibilities of the academic senate in the professional development arena. The process for the selection of the staff development coordinator should be a part of the staff development policies that senates develop with their boards. Title 5 ' 53203 (f) grants the authority to the academic senate to appoint faculty to groups dealing with academic and professional matters, which staff development certainly is, while the Education Code ' 70902(b)(4) grants right of assignment for employees to the governing board. Nonetheless, the selection of a staff development coordinator that will oversee faculty development is of great import to the academic senate and the senate should participate appropriately in the process. Senates should seek to consult on all policies for selecting and evaluating the coordinator. Such policies should include the senate in the development of the job description to the evaluation of the coordinator. If the selection of the coordinator is addressed in the local bargaining agreement, the negotiated process must be followed. (See the Academic Senate and Community College League of California (CCLC) paper *Participating Effectively in District and College Governance*, p.13).

Resources and Reassigned Time

Colleges with the most successful staff development programs traditionally fund those programs well, but generally staff development funding is woefully inadequate. Basically two major state staff development funding sources exist: the AB 1725 funding allocation from the state and TTIP training allocations accompanying the Chancellor=s statewide technology plan. As valuable as those funds are, AB1725 allocates less than $100 per employee statewide for staff development activities and the TTIP funds may only be used for technology training staff development activities.

The academic senate=s faculty development committee must be resourceful in seeking out and advocating for the use of other professional development money that is available on all campuses, but generally unknown. They may search for professional development opportunities in Chancellor=s Office grants, faculty diversity funds, Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (VTEA) funds, and CalWorks programs. Academic senates can request fiscal services officers to identify and review grants with the responsible project coordinator to determine implications for staff development. Title III grants, for instance, often include many dollars for staff, and particularly for faculty development. The faculty development committee can play a major role in extending such opportunities to the wider faculty. Special announcement flyers or staff development newsletters are good vehicles for

alerting faculty to training and professional development opportunities that may not be specifically under the auspices of the staff development coordinator.
It is important in considering resources to ensure adequate resources and appropriate reassigned time to staff development positions. If the institution is to make a real commitment to the professional development and training needs of its faculty and staff, it should be willing to expend institutional funds to support the human resources: the coordinators and support staff that plan, develop, and serve the faculty and staff. Where meager staff development funds are expended to pay salaries, staff development programs suffer.

Reports

Periodically the staff development coordinator is required to submit to the state a human resources development plan and a TTIP plan. Even in the absence of an academic senate sign off, senate presidents can request and take these documents to the senate for review. Again, they are public documents that will inform senates and provide opportunities for increased faculty involvement. A memo to the staff development coordinator or the administrator in charge of submitting the documentation with the request that the plan and budget be given to the academic senate for review prior to submission is in order since policies embedded in budget allocations have important implications for faculty and students and often involve policy choices that are under the purview of the academic senate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Local senates should study their local board policy regarding faculty development.

If there is no existing or no satisfactory existing faculty development policy, which assures the senate of collegial consultation and provides for appropriate participation of classified and management, local senates should write, adopt, and recommend to the administration a plan for the staff development program or, at least, write, adopt and recommend to the administration a policy for the faculty development program on their campus or district.

2. Local senates should consider developing in collegial consultation a fair and equitable policy for the allocation of the AB 1725 funds.

3. Local senates should ensure that the senate appoints faculty representatives to all staff development committees that contain faculty.

4. Local senates should consider establishing a local academic senate subcommittee, in addition to the cross-constituency committee, to work with the staff development coordinator on faculty development issues, and ensure that the chair of that committee reports regularly to the senate.

5. Local senates should clarify the processes by which staff development committees refer policy questions or proposed changes to the academic senate.
6. Local senates should ensure that the faculty development policy requires appropriate methods to assess the professional needs of faculty, that the faculty development activities are directed primarily to meet those needs, and that activities are evaluated on the basis of their effectiveness in meeting those needs.

7. Local senates consult with the administration to ensure adequate resources for staff development and adequate reassigned time to the staff development positions.

8. Local senates should consult with the administration in the development of processes and criteria for selecting and evaluating the staff development coordinator.

9. Local senates should develop a thorough knowledge of federal, state, and district funding allocations and when consulting in the annual college and district budget processes should seek new opportunities for faculty development, giving particular attention to categorical funding that may include staff development money and opportunities.

10. Local senates should insist that the senate review the state-required staff development human resources development plan and the end-of-the-year-reporting document specifying expenditures and activities. These documents should have been developed using agreed-upon processes and should reflect the priorities of the academic senate.

11. The Statewide Academic Senate should submit a proposal for increased staff development funds in the next state budget cycle and/or should work to ensure that sufficient staff development funds are embedded in any budget proposals for human resources and new programs and services

12. The Statewide Academic Senate should inform local senate presidents of their district staff development allocations, both from AB 1725 dollars and TTIP funds each year.

CONCLUSION

AB 1725 provides for professional and intellectual development for faculty through faculty development activities. Provision of professional development funds under that legislation was intended primarily Ato improve academic quality@ (AB 1725 Section 4 (n)). A professional faculty member must receive continual upgrading of discipline knowledge and pedagogical arts to ensure his or her professional growth. A strong faculty development program can greatly enhance the intellectual development and the professionalism of California community college instructors. The survey conducted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, however, reveals lack of understanding of the academic senate=s role in faculty development programs and inconsistent practices in developing and funding faculty development programs. To remedy this situation, local senates must begin to assert their rights and responsibilities relative to faculty development. They must take an active role in assuring that faculty receive the type of professional development and training that will enhance their performance and professionalism. To ensure that our students receive a quality education, senates must ensure that they receive instruction from superbly qualified and professionally supported faculty members.

Appendix

Education Code
Article 5 Community College Faculty and Staff Development Fund
'87150

87150. There is hereby created in the State Treasury the Community College Faculty and Staff Development Fund, to be administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the purpose of which is to provide state general funds to community colleges for supporting locally developed and implemented faculty and staff development programs.

APPENDIX B

Title 5 Regulations ' 53200

For the purpose of this Subchapter:

(a) AAFaculty@@ means those employees of a community college district who are employed in positions that are not designated as supervisory or management for the purposes of Article 5 (commencing with Section 3540) of Chapter 10.7 of Division 4 of Title 1 of the Government Code, and for which minimum qualifications for hire are specified by the Board of Governors.

(b) AAcademic senate,@ Afaculty council,@ and Afaculty senate@ means an organization formed in accordance with the provisions of this Subchapter whose primary function, as the representative of the faculty, is to make recommendations to the administration of a college and to the governing board of a district with respect to academic and professional matters. For purposes of this Subchapter, reference to the term Aacademic senate@ also constitutes reference to Afaculty council@ or Afaculty senate.@

(c) AAcademic and professional matters@ means the following policy development and implementation matters:

(1) curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines;
(2) degree and certificate requirements;
(3) grading policies;
(4) educational program development;
(5) standards or policies regarding student preparation and success;
(6) district and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles;
(7) faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports;
(8) policies for faculty professional development activities;
(9) processes for program review;
(10) processes for institutional planning and
(11) other academic and professional matters as are mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

(d) AConsult collegially@ means that the district governing board shall develop policies on academic and professional matters through either or both of the following methods, according to its own discretion:

(1) relying primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate; or
(2) agreeing that the district governing, or such representatives as it may designate, and the representatives of the academic senate shall have the obligation to reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of governing board effectuating

such recommendations.

APPENDIX C

Statewide Academic Senate
Faculty Development Committee Field Survey for Position Paper

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Faculty Development Committee is studying the practices of staff development programs as they relate to faculty development activities and to local senates. Your answers to this brief survey would help the committee in its work and would contribute to a position paper on best practices for faculty development programs. **Since we are primarily interested in the Academic Senate B Faculty Development link, we request that the academic senate president gather information and complete this form.** Please mail or Fax the survey as soon as possible but ***no later than January 30, 2000***, to:

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
910 K Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax (916) 323-9867

Please provide the following contact information:

Name and academic senate position of respondent:

College:

Address: _____
City: _____ Zip: _____ Phone: _____

Email: _____

Please answer the following questions as they pertain to your campus:

5. Do you have a cross-constituency staff (including faculty, staff, administrators) development committee on your campus? Please circle one: YES NO

   If yes, does the committee include a majority of faculty? Please circle one: YES NO

   Who appoints the faculty members to the staff development committee? _____

   How is the chair selected? _____

6. In addition to or in lieu of a cross-constituency committee, do you have a separate faculty development committee that plans and implements faculty staff

develo
pment
activiti
es?

Please circle one: YES

NO

7. How are the AB 1725 staff development funds allocated to the constituencies?
   Please check one:
   ____Through decisions of the staff development committee ____By formula
   ____Through mechanisms in the bargaining agreement ____By administrative decisions
   ____Other (please explain below)

8. In what ways do part-time faculty use faculty development funds?

9. What is the total allotment of reassigned time for all faculty staff development leaders at your college?
(Please report reassigned time as a percentage of a full-time teaching load, i.e. 50%, 20%.)

_____

6. Is there a process for allocating reassigned time? Please circle one:
YES NO
Please explain below.

7. How is the reassigned time funded? Please check one:
____Through institutional funds ____Through AB 1725 staff development funds
____Through Senate reassigned-time funds ____Other (please explain below)

8. What is the academic senate role in staff development in your college? (For instance, does the staff development faculty leader sit on the senate, report regularly to the senate, seek senate approval of staff development activities? Other?) Please answer below.

9. What are the most successful faculty development activities at your college?
Please check all that apply:

_____conference funding _____mini-grants _____retreats
_____new faculty orientation _____technology training
_____guest speakers
_____diversity training _____part-time faculty activities
_____other (please explain)

(j) What is your greatest unmet need for faculty development? (Please use a separate sheet of paper for this item if necessary.)

ATTACHMENT D

EXAMPLE STAFF DEVELOPMENT POLICY

The primary objective of the college is to create an outstanding learning environment that advances the development, growth, and success of each student. The Staff Development Program designs and supports professional growth activities and training for faculty and staff to provide a broad range of educational approaches and support services necessary to ensure that students achieve their highest potential. Consequently, the Staff Development mission is to support quality teaching, learning, and support services for all students by providing the necessary resources for employees to develop and fulfill career, personal, and professional needs and goals. Continuous professional development and training is essential to maintain highly qualified faculty and staff committed to serving the educational needs of students. The following organizational structure and staff positions will provide the foundation for a quality Staff Development Program.

I. Organizational Structure

10 **Staff Development Coordinator** - three-year term with one term renewable B selected by the administration and the senate in consultation; .8 and .4 reassigned time for the staff development positions to be allocated by the Staff Development Coordinator in consultation with administration

a. Roles/Responsibilities

- $ coordinates staff development program
- $ leads and facilitates the planning of the overall staff development program
- $ monitors the budget and prepares budget reports
- $ serves on college planning committees to facilitate training and professional growth activities applicable to institutional goals
- $ chairs Staff Development Cross Constituency Committee
- $ attends state and national conferences on strategic and long-range planning as related to staff development
- $ facilitates implementation of staff development activities
- $ coordinates goals and procedures with Technology Resource Center Coordinator
- $ targets innovations
- $ locates additional staff development funding sources
- $ serves as liaison with District Staff Development personnel and Committee
- $ oversees Flex schedule and activities
- $ communicates with the campus staff information concerning budget, constituency decisions, state policies etc.
- $ serves as a full voting member of the Academic Senate
- $ meets with constituency committees to facilitate and coordinate activities

b. Reporting Relationships

- reports to Dean of Instruction as specified in the organizational chart and to the Academic Senate

2. New Faculty Coordinator - two-year term with one term renewable - reassigned time to be determined by the Staff Development Coordinator in consultation with administration, depending upon the number of new faculty to be oriented.

a. Roles/Responsibilities
$ coordinates new faculty orientation
$ develops workshops/activities for new full-time faculty
$ surveys needs to determine new faculty topics and activities
$ identifies mentors
$ coordinates speakers for meetings
$ provides appropriate information/materials
$ facilitates part-time faculty activities
$ provides reports to Faculty Senate as needed

b. Reporting Relationships
$ reports to Dean of Instruction through the Staff Development Coordinator

3. Topic Specialist - optional position based on need and funding availability (possible funding sources TTIP, Affirmative Action, external grants, AB1725) selection and length of time determined by Staff Development Committee

a. Roles/Responsibilities - identifies issues and develops staff development activities that tie into institutional goals (i.e. diversity, learning communities, wellness, health and safety etc.)

b. Reporting Relationships - to be agreed upon between the Staff Development Coordinator and the administration; to be endorsed by the Academic Senate

4. Technology Training Coordinator - % of time based on need and budget - (possible funding source TTIP funds)

a. Roles/Responsibilities - oversees technology training for all faculty and staff
$ chairs Training Resource Advisory Committee
$ identifies and hires trainers and determines training schedule
$ facilitates technology training on campus
$ maintains hot-line to answer immediate technology classroom problems
$ available for drop-in instructional technology assistance
$ serves on Staff Development Committee to assist in institutional planning
$ trains faculty for educational technology needs
$ trains staff for operational technology needs
$ assesses and evaluates new software to meet campus needs

b. Reporting Relationships
$ to be determined

5. **Staff Development Center Classified Specialist** - full-time 40 hours per week.

a. Roles/Responsibilities
- $ provides long-term stability of day-to-day operations such as working knowledge of budget, state policies, budgeting process on campus, processing paperwork for all employees who attend conferences, providing Staff Development information on policies and procedures for all employees etc.
- $ overseas AB1725, Operational and Technology Training Funds
- $ produces newsletter, Flex brochure, new faculty informational materials, summer mailings to faculty regarding Flex events, part-time handbook, etc.
- $ recording secretary for Staff Development Committee
- $ has good interpersonal skills, able to take initiative, problem solve and handle multiple tasks
- $ fields questions from all constituency groups regarding upcoming Staff Development events, filling out forms etc.
- $ knowledgeable on current software: Word, Quicken, PageMaker, Excel

b. Reporting Relationships
- $ is accountable to the Staff Development Coordinator

II. Committees

1. **Classified Development Committee** - appointed by the Classified Senate - Chairperson to receive 75 hours per year reassigned time. Chairperson can allocate some of this time to others based on need.

a. Roles/Responsibilities
- $ assesses and develops classified training and professional growth staff development activities
- $ establishes policies and guidelines for funding

b. Reporting Relationships
- $ chairperson reports to Classified Senate

2. **Administrative Committee** B appointed by the president

a. Roles/Responsibilities
- $ assesses and develops administrative training and professiona
- $ establishes policies and guidelines for funding

b. Reporting Relationships
- $ chairperson reports to President's Advisory Committee

3. Faculty Committee B appointed by the Academic Senate

a. Roles/Responsibilities

$ facilitate the development of Flex activities during Flex week and variable Flex activities

$ establishes funding categories and guidelines for faculty conference travel, mini grants, special projects, etc.

b. Reporting Relationships

$ Chair of Faculty Staff Development Committee reports to the Academic Senate

4. Collegewide Staff Development Committee

a. Roles/Responsibilities

$ plans and coordinates college wide staff development activities th

$ is responsible for determining funding priorities of 10% of the Staff Development Budget (after payment of classified office position) to develop projects, conferences, etc. that target institutional needs

$ committee composition will include 6 voting members - 2 faculty, 2 classified, 2 managers and 2 nonvoting members

$ Staff Development Coordinator and Dean of Instruction Staff Development Coordinator will break tie votes.

b. Reporting Relationships

$ Staff Development Committee reports to governance committee